

Serial No. 10/086,698
Art Unit 2638

REMARKS

Claims 15 and 16 have been deleted. Claims 17 and 18 have been added. These claims are method claims corresponding to previous claims 15 and 16. The Applicant submits that the only new subject matter in the claims and not present in claims 15 and 16 is the step of establishing an IP-in-IP tunnel to the neighbouring node, which finds support in the description at page 7 line 13, and updating the forwarding redirection table to reflect the new route, which finds support in the description at page 7 line 18.

The Examiner has rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Lambda-Labeling: A Framework for IP-over-WDM using MPLS" by Nasir and U.S. Patent 5,398,236 issued to Hemmady. Claim 17 is directed to a method in which a node determines an alternate route to a neighbouring node. The node establishes an IP-in-IP tunnel to the neighbouring node based on the alternate route. The node maintains a forwarding redirection table, and the node updates the forwarding redirection table to reflect the alternate route. Claim 18 is directed to the same method but in which IP packets are forwarded according to the forwarding redirection table.

The method recited in claim 17 allows a node to maintain and dynamically adjust a forwarding redirection table on its own. Before sending a packet to the interface indicated by the routing table used in traditional IP routing, the forwarding redirection table is used to determine if the interface through which the packet is to be sent has been redirected because of link failure detected by the node. Since this forwarding redirection table is maintained and updated by the node itself, there is no need for NMS intervention.

The routing information stored in the CPU of the nodes of an ATM network, taught by Hemmady, is not the same as the forwarding redirection table maintained and updated by the node as recited in claim 17 of the present application. The routing information of Hemmady is predefined by the NMS, which is not part of the ATM node, and the information is not dynamically and autonomously updated by the node itself. Such a forwarding redirection table is also not taught or suggested by Nasir. Neither Hemmady nor Nasir teach updating, at a node at which a failure in the control link to a

Serial No. 10/086,698
Art Unit 2638

neighbouring node has been detected, a forwarding redirection table to map forwarding interfaces leading to the neighbouring node via a newly routed IP-in-IP tunnel.

Claim 18 includes the same limitations as claim 17. Claim 18 further includes the limitation that IP packets are forwarded to the forwarding interface indicated by the forwarding redirection table, an element which the Applicant respectfully submits is not taught or suggested by Nasir or Hemmady as neither reference discloses a forwarding redirection table, as explained above.

The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claims 17 and 18 are not obvious in view of Nasir and Hemmady, as the references do not teach every element of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the claims as amended herein are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and action to this end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



S. Mark Budd
Registration No. 53,880
Agent of Record

MARKS & CLERK
P.O. Box 957, Station B
Ottawa, ON K1P 5S7 (613)236-9561